

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,832	MURAKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Julian D. Huffman	2853	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julian D. Huffman. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Randi B. Isaacs. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Foster et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**JULIAN D. HUFFMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative argued that the secondary reference Foster does not detect a change of the mechanical module from a static condition to a dynamic condition. The examiner stated that Foster applies a series of driving pulses to the piezoelectric element via the maintenance drive circuit and while applying these pulses, the response of the piezoelectric element is detected. In the process of detecting the response as separate drive pulses are sent to the drive circuit, Foster detects the change from a static condition to a dynamic condition. Even though the focus of Foster's invention is not to detect the change from a static to a dynamic condition, Foster performs this in the process of detecting while driving the piezoelectric element. The examiner suggested that the claims be amended to recite determining if the mechanical module is in a static or dynamic condition, and/or more specifically reciting what the invention does with the result of detection of the condition change. Upon a review of the Foster reference, the examiner agreed that Foster does not determine if the piezoelectric element is in a static condition or a dynamic condition. *MM*